

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Trevor Hackett	Team: Squad #13	CCRB Case #: 202002424	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Saturday, 03/14/2020 3:20 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 84	18 Mo. SOL 9/14/2021	EO SOL 5/1/2022	
Date/Time CV Reported Sat, 03/14/2020 3:23 AM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 03/30/2020 11:12 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Daniel Sandberg	14067	947456	084 PCT
2. POM Keith Drummond	14115	940106	084 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Daniel Sandberg	Abuse: Police Officer Daniel Sandberg refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
B.POM Daniel Sandberg	Abuse: Police Officer Daniel Sandberg refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
C.POM Keith Drummond	Abuse: Police Officer Keith Drummond refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
D.POM Keith Drummond	Abuse: Police Officer Keith Drummond refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(4-b) § 87(2)(g)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)
§ 87(4-b) § 87(2)(g)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

### Case Summary

On March 14, 2020, § 87(2)(b) called IAB and filed this complaint, which the CCRB received on March 30, 2020.

On March 14, 2020, at approximately 3:20 a.m., § 87(2)(b) and an unidentified individual were in § 87(2)(b) vehicle and waiting at a red light in front of 63 Tillary Street in Brooklyn. Police Officer Daniel Sandberg and Police Officer Keith Drummond of the 84<sup>th</sup> Precinct pulled their vehicle behind § 87(2)(b) and stopped her (**Allegations A and B: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). During the stop, PO Sandberg and PO Drummond allegedly refused to provide § 87(2)(b) with their names and shield numbers upon request (**Allegation C and E – Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**; **Allegation D and F – Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)**). § 87(4-b) § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) received a summons for a broken rearview mirror as a result of this incident. The § 87(2)(b) [§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)] (Board Review 12).

PO Sandberg's and PO Drummond's Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage was obtained from NYPD Legal. The footage is located in IAs #50-51 (**Board Review 01, 02**) and summarized in IA #55 (**Board Review 03**).

### Findings and Recommendations

**Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Daniel Sandberg stopped § 87(2)(b)**  
**Allegation B - Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Keith Drummond stopped § 87(2)(b)**

It is undisputed that while § 87(2)(b) was waiting at a traffic light, an unidentified male teenager exited her car and exposed his bare buttocks to PO Sandberg and PO Drummond, who were parked nearby. It is further undisputed that the officers stopped § 87(2)(b) and issued her a summons for having a broken rear-view mirror.

§ 87(2)(b) stated that after the teenager exited her vehicle and exposed himself to the officers, he immediately fled the location. PO Sandberg and PO Drummond activated their turret lights and stopped § 87(2)(b). PO Sandberg and PO Drummond approached her vehicle and PO Sandberg ordered her to call the teenager to come back. § 87(2)(b) said she did not know the teenager and could not call them. PO Sandberg said something to the effect of, "Okay, well, now you get to face the consequences for the company you keep," and told § 87(2)(b) that the officers were going to conduct a vehicle inspection. PO Sandberg and PO Drummond observed that § 87(2)(b) rear-view mirror was broken. PO Drummond said § 87(2)(b) break lights were not working, which § 87(2)(b) disputed.

PO Sandberg stated that after the teenager exposed himself, he reentered § 87(2)(b) vehicle. The officers pulled up behind § 87(2)(b) vehicle, which was still stopped at the intersection, and activated their turret lights. The teenager then exited § 87(2)(b) vehicle and fled the scene. Given the strange behavior of the teenager, PO Sandberg approached § 87(2)(b) in order to see if everything was okay. PO Sandberg said § 87(2)(b) was not stopped at this point and that she had not committed any offenses prior to him approaching her. Upon approaching the vehicle, PO Sandberg observed that § 87(2)(b) rearview mirror was missing and that she was not wearing her seatbelt. PO Sandberg could not recall the details of the conversation he had with § 87(2)(b).

§ 87(2)(g) PO Drummond said the

officers were parked less than 100 feet away from § 87(2)(b) vehicle, and that after the teenager reentered her vehicle, PO Drummond was able to observe that § 87(2)(b) was not wearing her seatbelt and did not have a rearview mirror. PO Drummond said the officers stopped § 87(2)(b) with the intention of issuing her summonses for these offenses in addition to summoning the teenager for § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) did not commit any additional offenses.

PO Sandberg's and PO Drummond's BWC footage does not capture this part of the incident.

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation C – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Daniel Sandberg refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation D – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Daniel Sandberg refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation E – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Keith Drummond refused to provide his name to § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation F – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Keith Drummond refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)**

PO Sandberg's and PO Drummond's BWC footage begins as the officers are already inside of their vehicle with § 87(2)(b) documentation to issue her a summons for her broken rear-view mirror.

PO Sandberg's BWC footage begins as he is writing the summons. At the 05:10-mark on the media player timestamp, visible at the bottom of the screen, PO Sandberg and PO Drummond exit their vehicle and return to § 87(2)(b) vehicle. At 05:33, § 87(2)(b) asks what the summons is for and PO Sandberg says it is for driving without a rear-view mirror. § 87(2)(b) asks if she was pulled over for the rear-view mirror or because of someone else. PO Sandberg begins to say she was stopped because of a person she was with, but at 05:43, § 87(2)(b) interrupts him and says, "May I please have both of your names?" PO Sandberg says, "It's on the summons," begins walking back to the police vehicle, and says "You don't want to talk to me, I won't talk to you." The officers reenter their vehicle and the video ends. At no point does § 87(2)(b) ask either officer for their shield number (**Board Review 01**).

PO Drummond's BWC footage captures this interaction from a different angle. At the 04:58 minute-mark of the media player timestamp, visible at the bottom of the screen, PO Drummond approaches the rear passenger side of § 87(2)(b) vehicle, leans down toward the lowered window, and faces § 87(2)(b). As PO Sandberg speaks to § 87(2)(b) PO Drummond does not say anything. At 05:28, as PO Drummond is still leaning down towards the open window, § 87(2)(b) who is looking out her window such that the back of her head faces PO Drummond, asks PO Sandberg for the officers' names. PO Drummond does not respond to § 87(2)(b) and immediately begins walking back to the police vehicle. The footage does not capture any passing traffic or background noise at the location (**Board Review 02**).

§ 87(2)(b) said after PO Sandberg and PO Drummond returned to her vehicle and handed her the summons, she noticed that neither officer was wearing their name plates or shields. She asked them

both for their names and shield numbers. PO Sandberg said the information was on the summons and PO Drummond pointed to the summons. § 87(2)(b) asked where on the summons the information was located and repeated her request for their names and shield numbers. Without responding to § 87(2)(b) request, PO Sandberg and PO Drummond left **(Board Review 04)**.

PO Sandberg § 87(2)(g) said there was no other traffic on the road at the time of the incident. He initially denied that § 87(2)(b) requested his or PO Drummond's names and shield numbers, though after viewing the BWC footage, he said he did not recall § 87(2)(b) requesting the officers' names during the incident. PO Sandberg said his name would have been on the summons he issued § 87(2)(b). After reviewing a photo of the handwritten summons that was uploaded to his electronic memo book, he acknowledged that nothing was written in the space provided for the officer's name and said his pen may have run out of ink. **(Board Review 05)**.

PO Drummond § 87(2)(g) denied that § 87(2)(b) asked him for his name and shield number upon returning to her vehicle and did not recall if she requested either officers name or shield number from PO Sandberg. After reviewing his BWC footage, PO Drummond said he did not hear § 87(2)(b) ask PO Sandberg for the officers' names at the time of the incident **(Board Review 06)**.

PO Sandberg uploaded a photo of the summons he issued to § 87(2)(b) to his electronic memo book. The space for the issuing officer's name is blank **(Board Review 07)**.

NYPD Patrol Guide, Procedure 203-09 states that upon request, officers must courteously and clearly state their rank, name, shield number and command, or otherwise provide it **(Board Review 08)**.

§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)  
§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(4-b) § 87(2)(g)

#### Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first CCRB complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (**Board Review 10**).
- PO Drummond has been a member of the NYPD for 14 years. He has been a subject in six additional complaints, totaling nine allegations, none of which were substantiated. ■

§ 87(2)(g)

- PO Sandberg has been a member of the NYPD for four years. He has been a subject in five additional complaints, totaling 11 allegations, four of which were substantiated. ■

§ 87(2)(g)

- Case 201800251 involved a substantiated allegation of the use of pepper spray. The Board recommended Command Discipline A, which the NYPD imposed.
- Case 201803893 involved substantiated allegations of a search of a person, threat of force, and verbal discourtesy. The case is currently assigned to the APU.

#### Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint.
- As of March 30, 2021, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed regarding this incident (**Board Review 11**).

- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad No.: 13

Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_ Inv. Trevor Hackett 10/02/2021  
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: \_\_\_\_\_ IM Laura Kastner 10/02/2021  
Signature Print Title & Name Date